

MONTEREY PENINSULA COLLEGE

RESPONSE TO 2000 MONTEREY COUNTY CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT

Grand Jury Findings

1. The contracts between MPC and the sports clubs do not specify that briefing or materials be given to enrollees of PFIT 421 informing them of the attendance requirements and procedures.

MPC Response: The respondent disagrees partially with the finding. The contracts between MPC and the fitness centers do not mention briefings or materials; however, Title 5 regulations do not require community college instructional contracts to provide that briefing or materials be given to students informing them of attendance requirements and procedures. The contracts between the college and the fitness centers do state, "that the Agency (fitness center) shall administer the course ... in compliance with college policies and procedures." These policies and procedures include adherence to the course outline, which describes the content of the course, including information to be given to students. The course outline for PFIT 421 is given and explained to each fitness center staff member involved with this course.

2. The contracts between MPC and the sports clubs require no specific on-site monitoring or verification of student participation in the PFIT 421 course.

MPC Response: The respondent disagrees partially with finding. While the contracts between MPC and the fitness centers require no specific on-site monitoring, the contracts do require the fitness centers to maintain accurate student and class records. These records are to be submitted to MPC in compliance with college policies and procedures. Furthermore, in accordance with California Community College regulations, MPC also requires that instructor minimum qualifications be met by fitness center personnel who provide the instructional offerings and on-site assistance to students.

3. A review of the attendance records revealed that at one sports club some students signed in multiple times within a few minutes. This resulted in an overstatement of student training hours. Some of the redundant hours were discovered during the records review by the MPC registrar's staff and were not credited. In other cases, however, the redundant hours were not discovered, and this resulted in over payments to the sports club by MPC and to MPC by the state. Due to the volume of attendance records, the Grand Jury was unable to determine the exact number of redundant hours not disallowed, as well as the exact amount overpaid.

MPC Response: The respondent agrees with the finding; however, some inaccuracy in recordkeeping is typical and to be expected when an enormous volume of records are involved. The respondent estimates that the number of hours in question (as well as any overpayments) was insignificant, constituting a few hundred hours. This inaccuracy

would represent less than three hundredths of a percent (.03%) of the total training hours generated by the fitness centers and less than one hundredth of a percent (.01%) of the enrollment reported by the college to the state. In addition, some of these training hours would have been offset by students who failed to sign in each and every time they attended. For these reasons, the inaccuracy is minor and does not constitute a material error.

4. Course attendance is recorded on different forms and in different formats, which makes program auditing more difficult.

MPC Response: The respondent agrees with the finding; however, as the fitness centers are independently owned and operated, they each employ different software programs to record attendance.

5. No evidence was found that any local sports club was being excluded from the program. Any sports club can participate as long as it meets the program requirements.

MPC Response: The respondent agrees with the finding.

Grand Jury Recommendations

1. All contracts between MPC and participating sports clubs be modified to include a requirement that a briefing be given to each enrollee of PFIT 421 regarding his or her status as an MPC student, as well as an explanation that stresses that the attendance roster is to be signed only once per instruction session.

MPC Response: The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in part when contract renewal is due. Contracts will be renewed for the Fall 2001 through Summer 2002 term before the conclusion of the Summer 2001 term and will include a provision that each enrollee receives additional information regarding his/her status as an MPC student. As mentioned in response to Grand Jury Finding #1, the college is not required under Title V regulations to include in its instructional contracts a requirement that briefing or materials be given to students informing them of attendance sign-in procedures.

2. MPC establish means to monitor the conduct of the off-campus PFIT 421 course and insure student participation.

MPC Response: The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented beginning with the commencement of the Fall 2001 term.

3. A more comprehensive review be performed by the MPC registrar staff on attendance rosters to eliminate overpayments due to multiple sign-ins.

MPC Response: The recommendation has been implemented. To reiterate the college's response to Grand Jury Finding #3, the number of hours in question (as well as any overpayments) was insignificant, constituting a few hundred hours. This inaccuracy would represent less than three hundredths of a percent (.03%) of the total training hours generated by the fitness centers and less than one hundredth of a percent (.01%) of the enrollment reported by the college to the state. However, to address this minor inaccuracy, both fitness center and MPC staff now examine all source documents, which record the dates and times of students' participation, for erroneous or multiple visitations (sign-ins).

4. Attendance records be standardized to facilitate auditing.

MPC Response: The recommendation cannot be implemented due to the hardship that would be imposed on the fitness centers. Each fitness center is unique, varying in size, operational origins and ownership, and in its economic means to realize and support such standardization. However, each of the fitness centers *is* required to submit the same information, which is a record of each student's visitation times and dates.